

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted supplementary to the previous Amendment and in connection with the interview with the Examiner.

During the interview the Examiner indicated that U.S. patent no. 3,445,760 was considered as a pertinent reference.

In connection with this applicant has amended claim 1, the broadest claim on file, as well as some dependent claims, and also made some changes in the specification.

Before the analysis of the prior art, it is believed to be advisable to explain the changes which were made in the specification and in the claims in formal aspects.

In the original test of the German priority application the element 28 was identified as "Spulenkörper" which was translated as -- coil form -- or -- coil frame --. The more accurate translation of this term should have been -- coil body --.

Also, in the original German priority application it was stated that the coil body 28 is composed for example of plastic and is integrally "angespritzt" on the oblong pole shoe 24. The term "angespritzt" was translated originally --extruded --. However the more accurate term is -- injection-molded --.

These are the corrections which have been made with the present Amendment in the specification and in the claims.

Since this application is a U.S. national phase of the PCT application, and the application was filed together with the German text of the PCT application which therefore constitutes a part of the original disclosure, it is believed that there is a clear justification for the above mentioned changes of the terms, since they are based on the original disclosure of the applications as filed.

Turning now to the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, the broadest claim on file, now defines that the coil body 28 is integrally injection-molded on the pole shoe 15 and carries the coil 11.

The patent to Collens (U.S. patent no. 3,441,760) deals with a frame assembly for dynamoelectric machine and was issued in 1969. This reference discloses a stator with some form of a pole as well. However, the reference does not disclose the use of a coil body on which a coil is wound and also does not contain any hint or suggestion for such a coil body. Also, neither this reference nor other references applied or cited by the Examiner disclose a coil body which is injection-molded on a pole shoe and carries a coil thereon. This feature also can not be derived from the Collens patent or from other references as a matter of obviousness.

It is therefore believed that claim 1 as amended should be considered as patentably distinguishing the present invention over the prior art and therefore this claim should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 08 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800